

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 28 September 2007. Responsive to the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-14, 18, 19, 21, and 25-29 have been amended, and Claims 4, 23-24, and 31-33 have been canceled. Upon entry of this Amendment, Claims 1-3, 5-22, 25-30 will be pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 2 due to informalities therein. Accordingly, Claim 2 has been amended to correct the informality kindly noted by the Examiner. The Examiner also objected to Claims 5-7, 10-14, 18-20, 27-30, 32, and 33 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form, because a multiple dependent Claim are not serve as a basis for any other multiple dependent claims. Accordingly, these Claims have been amended to correct the dependencies thereof.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 2 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the DiChiara, et al. reference (U.S. Patent #6,890,073), and Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Ohba reference (U.S. Patent #4,978,209). Additionally, the Examiner rejected Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohba in view of the McCormick reference (U.S. Patent #6,802,604). However, the Examiner kindly indicated that Claims 15-17 were allowed, and Claims 3, 4 and 24 would be allowable if rewritten in Independent form including all of the limitations of the base Claim and any intervening Claims.

Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate all of the limitations of Claim 4 therein. Therefore, Claim 4 has effectively been rewritten in Independent form including all of the limitations of the base Claim, Claim 1, and any intervening Claims, which there were none. Thus, Independent Claim 1 and the Claims dependent thereon should now be allowable. Further, the subject matter of Claim 1 has been added to Claim 3, thereby placing that claim in independent, including all of the limitations of the base Claim, Claim 1, and any intervening Claims, which there were none. Thus, Claim 3 should now be allowable. Additionally, Claim 21 has been amended to incorporate all of the limitations of Claim 24 therein. Therefore, Claim 24 has effectively been rewritten in Independent form including all of the limitations of the base Claim, Claim 21, and all of the limitations of the one intervening, Claim 23. Thus, Independent Claim 21 and the Claims dependent thereon should now be allowable. Applicant has canceled Claims 31-33 in order to advance the prosecution of this case.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

MR3847-8
Application Serial No.10/589,918
Responsive to Office Action dated 28 September 2007

The Director is hereby authorized to pay any deficiencies in fees associated with the filing of this Reply, should there be any, from Deposit Account # 18-2011.

Respectfully submitted,

FOR: ROSENBERG KLEIN & LEE

/David I. Klein/

David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: 28 January 2008

3458 Ellicott Center Drive, Suite 101
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted electronically to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Art Unit # 2873, on the date shown below.

For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

/David I. Klein/
DAVID I. KLEIN

1/28/2008
Date